DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 092 536 SP 008 128

AUTHOR Darcy, C. Michael; And Others
TITLE Papers on Collaboration and Teacher Preparation.
INSTITUTION New York State Education Dept., Albany. Div. of Teacher Education and Certification.; State Univ. of New York, Albany.
PUB DATE [74]
NOTE 54p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Consortia; *Cooperative Planning; *Governance; Performance Based Teacher Education; Problems; *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

This document is a collection of three papers prepared as a result of a mandate for a collaborative approach in preparing professionals for the public schools in New York State. In "Working through a Consortium," C. Michael Darcy, writing on the assumption that the consortium is the most desirable future state for the governance of teacher education, discusses some problems involved, organizational structure, and some affirmatives for using a consortium for solving governance problems. In "Consortia: Striving toward a Unified Profession," Robert E. Gabreys discusses the rationale for consortia, basic concerns in making consortia operational, and an effort to establish a consortium involving Syracuse University. "Collaboration: It's Worth All the Pain!" by Mary Mann includes a discussion on setting the stage for consortia, problems of collaborative decision making in education consortia, collaboration in performance-based teacher education, and guidelines. Two appendixes and a bibliography for shared decision making are included. (PD)

ED 092539

PAPERS

ON

COLLABORATION

AND

TEACHER PREPARATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Division of Teacher Education and Certification
99 Washington Avenue
Albany, New York 12210

ED 092539

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Regents of the University (with years when terms expire)

1984	Joseph W. McGovern, A.B., J.D., L.H.D., LL.D., D.C.L., Litt. D. Chancellor -	New York
1981	Theodore M. Black, A.B., Litt.D., Vice Chancellor -	Sands Point
1978	Alexander J. Allan, Jr., LL.D., Litt.D. - - - - - - - - - - -	Troy
1987	Carl H. Pforzheimer, Jr., A.B., M.B.A., D.C.S., H.H.D., - -	Purchase
1975	Edward M. M. Warburg, B.S., L.H.D. - - - - - - - - - - - - -	New York
1980	Joseph T. King., LL.B. -	Shelter Islan
1981	Joseph C. Indelicato, M.D. - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Brooklyn
1976	Mrs. Helen B. Power, A.B., Litt.D., L.H.D., LL.D. - - - - - -	Rochester
1979	Francis W. McGinley, B.S., J.D., LL.D. - - - - - - - - - - -	Glens Falls
1986	Kenneth B. Clark, A.B., M.S., Ph.D., LL.D., L.H.D., D.Sc.- -	Hastings-on-Hudson
1983	Harold E. Newcomb, B.A. - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Owego
1988	Willard A. Genrich, LL.B., L.H.D. - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Buffalo
1982	Emlyn I. Griffith, A.B., J.D. - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Rome
1981	William Jovanovich, A.B., LL.D., Litt.D., L.H.D. - - - - - - -	Briarcliff Manor
1981	Genevieve S. Klein, B.S., M.A. - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Bayside

President of the University and Commissioner of Education
Ewald B. Nyquist

Executive Deputy Commissioner of Education
Gordon M. Ambach

Deputy Commissioner for Higher Education
T. Edward Hollander

Associate Commissioner for Academic Development
Alvin P. Lierheimer

Director, Division of Teacher Education and Certification
Vincent C. Gazzetta

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword - i

About the Authors - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - ii

Working Through A Consortium - - - - - - - - - - - 1 - 4
by C. Michael Darcy

Consortia: Striving Toward
A Unified Profession - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 5 - 13
by Robert E. Gabrys

Collaboration - It's Worth All The Pain! - - - - 14 - 25
by Mary Mann

Appendix A - 26 - 38

Appendix B - 39 - 47

A Bibliography for Shared
Decision Making - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 48 - 49

FOREWORD

In the section on teacher education and certification in the 1972 Regents Plan for the Development of Postsecondary Education, the Board of Regents stated a conviction that "The preparation of teachers should involve a number of pertinent agencies and individuals; including schools, higher institutions, professional staffs, and relevant agencies. The ideal professional training would integrate theoretical understanding and clinical experience in a system of mutual correction and reinforcement."

The policy set by the Board of Regents is being implemented by requiring preparatory programs to give evidence of the significant functional involvement of representation of the schools, professional staffs of the schools, and college or university in the planning, development, implementation, and evaluation of preparatory programs.

The mandate for a collaborative approach in preparing professionals for the public schools has raised a host of questions among members of the State's educational community. Moreover, while there is general agreement that there is a need for closer cooperation among the three parties in preparing teachers there exists a considerable amount of uncertainty among the parties as to the degree and kind of collaboration which is appropriate.

It should be noted that there are several examples of developing or operating consortia in New York. In some instances the consortia have been developed in response to Department stimulation. Such is the case in the thirteen Trial Projects. Some represent direct Federal program support as in the case of the National Teacher Corps programs in New York. And some are the result of the realization that improvement in teacher education and certification requires the significant involvement of the schools, their professional staffs, and higher education.

At the Department's request three persons who are intimately involved in preparatory program consortia were asked to prepare papers dealing with collaboration from their own perspective. The three papers are presented with the hope that they will be of help to the administration and staff of both public schools and higher education institutions.

Also included in this publication are some sample working agreements between the parties at interest in consortia and a bibliography of some references which relate to the collaborative issues.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

C. Michael Darcy is the Associate Director of the Teacher Education Development Services and a visiting lecturer in the Department of Educational Administration at the State University of New York at Albany. Prior to his present responsibilities he was the Schenectady School District Coordinator for the Teacher Corps Program.

Robert E. Gabrys is the Director of the Office of Educational Services, School of Education at Syracuse University. His office has responsibility for field experiences, student teaching, career planning and placement, and certification, as well as admissions.

Mary Mann is Director of the Southern Tier Trial Project in Corning, New York. She was previously associated with the Colleges of the Finger Lakes Consortium and has also served as a team leader and consultant in the Martin Luther King School in Syracuse, New York.

WORKING THROUGH A CONSORTIUM

C. Michael Darcy

The analysis of a problem involves three phases. First, the situation must be described. Then one or more alternative, possible, future states must be identified. Finally, a choice must be made and plans laid for the achievement of the most desirable, or least undesirable, possible future states. The situation is that the parties to teacher education have each been criticizing the preparation of new teachers and each has been assigning the responsibility for this failure to the other. Among the various alternatives which were considered the Teacher Corps Programs and the Regents of the State of New York, and others have selected the use of consortia as the most desirable, or least undesirable, future states for the governance of teacher education. Now the parties, which formally enjoyed the luxury of being able to criticize with limited liability for improving the situation, must cooperatively make plans and take responsibility for implementing the mandated future state.

A consortium is a partnership or union of corporate entities. There is an implication of an institutional peer group relationship. It is not an arrangement whereby one entity is in the employ or subordinated or is the client of the other. A consortium is an operational arrangement for the accomplishment of certain tasks. It is held together by an overlap of interests--in this case, teacher education. A consortium is also an organization, but without the traditional sanctions of most organizations. Until it is firmly established, and often not then, a consortium does not control its membership or its own resources. Actually the reverse is true. The membership tends to control the consortium through granting or withholding resources or cooperation. For these reasons a consortium can't be forced. The consortium has to grow through the shared experience of solving consortium problems.

The first problem, in order of occurrence, is the evolution of a common vocabulary through which the members of the consortium can communicate. At the very first meeting problems of communication become evident. As the consortium has to deal with real people on a peer group level this problem cannot be resolved, a priori, through a glossary. A glossary prepared and presented before the group comes to a decision that a glossary is necessary, will most likely be taken as a move to establish status by one party by means of talking down to the others. A common vocabulary has to evolve from the group over a period of time.

The second problem which will probably occur but which will probably be obvious long before the group can discuss it is that of mutual respect. In calling together professors of education as representatives of colleges, administrators representing school districts, and teacher union leaders as representatives of teachers, the group starts with a number of stereotypes which can be used to excuse one's own closed mind. College professors are often seen by others as impractical ivory tower dwellers. College professors often see others as fine workers in the field who have no theoretical grasp of what they are doing. Teacher union people are often

C. Michael Darcy is the Associate Director of the Teacher Education Developmental Service, State University of New York at Albany

viewed by others as narrowly interested in only the monetary aspects of teacher welfare. Teacher union people often view administrators and professors as paternalistic status seekers who don't know what it's like in the classroom. Overcoming preconceptions and building a basis for effective cooperation takes time and patience. Each representative of each constituency has to be given time to express his personal and institutional point of view and to absorb the views of others.

Related to this problem is the problem of working out a style of cooperation. Some consortia will rely on formal statements, a constitution, by-laws, resolutions, and Robert's Rules. Others will choose an informal style. Some will devote a portion of each meeting to social activities and community building while others will be businesslike. These styles also take time to evolve. These styles should be allowed to evolve. The presentation by one group of a set of answers to this or other problems without waiting for the group to decide that a formal statement is needed will probably not be an acceptable move. The group will need time to develop its working style.

The process of communication often provides a problem. If it is not solved early on it will recur. There seem to be three types of communication in a consortium. The first is the exchange of thoughts, information and feelings as the group works out its problems and tasks. This is usually done on a face-to-face basis at meetings. The group should be careful not to fix people and constituencies into position by putting too much down on paper. The memory has the capacity to edit itself and delete unfortunate statements. The second type of communication is the statement of agreements. This is often done in the form of minutes of the meeting. Whichever constituency has the greatest facility for the duplication and distribution of minutes or other official communications should be charged with that function. It seems that it takes two weeks for most consortia to communicate in writing to all the representatives; one day to write, one day to type, one day to duplicate, address and mail, three days for the public mail, one day for the office mail and a week to read and absorb the information. There are some routine bits of information which can be distributed more quickly such as cancellation of a meeting. This can be done by phone but it takes a person who has all day to make the several phone calls to reach all those involved. Again the function should be given to that person or constituency which has the resources to carry it out. Whatever type of communication problem and alternative resolutions are considered, their common solution involves time.

Each of the problems considered to this point has a common factor in their solution time. How will the consortium "buy" the time it needs? One way to buy time is with money or some resource which can be converted into money. For example, at least one consortium has proposed to pay those attending consortium meetings for their time. Several consortia have arrangements whereby the administrators and teachers serving on the consortia get released time from other assignments for some if not all consortia business. In some cases it may be possible to grant consortia participants either graduate credit for independent study or seminar or in-district, in-service credit for service to the district.

Possibly more important in the long run than the dollars involved is the recognition that the efforts put forth have value and are recognized and accepted. If the participants, whether institutions or individuals, begin to see a useful, valuable program emerge that reflects the concerns and ideas brought to the group by that participant, their continued cooperation is probable. The worth and value of the participation of individual representatives and institutional members of a consortium can be given formal recognition through the structure of the consortium. For example, the quorum rule should state that all three classes of institutions which are members of the consortium must be represented. The voting procedure should require not only a majority of those present and voting, but also a majority from each class of institution represented.

One of the tasks of a consortium is organizing itself to solve the problems of program development, operation and renewal with which it is faced. Various committees or task groups must be set up. These need to relate to each other and to the consortium and to the individuals given specific responsibility for performing particular tasks. Any number of variations are possible but it would seem that at least three levels of organization have been needed in those consortia now functioning. The first level, called by various names, is concerned with policy and the overall direction of the consortium. It is on this level that matters of conflicting member interests or values are resolved. It is also this level that acts as the legal entity, the consortium, when submitting proposals, or making decisions. A second level is that of committees or task groups or task forces. These can be organized around topics such as general education, math education and the like, but they also need to be organized around consortium functions such as management staff, resources, internal communications, project evaluation, and so forth. The third level is that of individuals, people given particular jobs to do.

The evolution and formalization of such a structure, more or less elaborated as the needs and resources of the consortium indicate, will greatly facilitate the work of the consortium. It will allow individuals the freedom, within known limits, to work and develop programs. It will allow matters of detail to be dealt with by the appropriate people or groups. It will keep to a minimum the time expended by individuals or groups on issues which have to be dealt with on the policy level. Emphasis should be placed on the evolution and the formalization of these relationships. They will take time to evolve. Many false starts will be made before the system is established. Formalization is necessary in the sense that these arrangements are agreed upon and known or the whole deal can be ignored.

The total effort may be wasted because of small errors in developing the idea or its presentation and the idea may be lost. Further, the development of the idea, in this model, must occur at least twice, once in the startup group and again in the larger group. Through a consortium several tasks can be accomplished at the same time.

Through the consortium, a proposal can be aired and knowledge gained as to what is acceptable and unacceptable to the various constituencies. A working knowledge of the constraints within which the other constituencies exist is available to each participant.

Cooperation needed for cooperative implementation of an acceptable idea is largely assured because the idea is one worked out cooperatively. A coordinated program for a major change on all levels can be designed, including the support system. For example, a team teaching program could be worked out involving changes in organizational patterns, the teacher's contract, the use of school resources and the training of personnel for new roles. While it may have to be presented to others in the constituencies for approval, the presentor is a member of that constituency who was delegated to bring in new ideas. His problem is much smaller than that of an outsider seeking entry.

Difficulties and problems can be negotiated in one place through an exisiting structure. Without the three-way consortium, the negotiations would have to take at least twice as long in bilateral negotiations. For example, a teachers' union idea would have to be negotiated with the district separately and then with the university. If they both agreed in general but had specific objections which differed, the idea would have to go back to the district and then back to the university, and so forth. By bringing the three constituencies together in one place, the idea can be presented in one meeting, discussed, brought back to the constituencies, and voted upon at the next meeting.

The consortium also provides a structure for the rather separate viewpoints of the constituencies to interact. Something seen from one point of view may be quite different from another viewpoint. Some, for example, believe that colleges should have an important influence on the curriculum of secondary schools. The school people believe that the expectation of the colleges do not take into account the limitations of resources and the development of students. If colleges dominate teacher training, teachers might be prepared who can teach content and not children. The schools might prepare teachers of children who know no content. By sharing program governance an approximation of balance may be achieved.

A consortium that works and shares information and decision making is an excellent vehicle for the design, management, evaluation and redesign of a project whose goal is change. Such a consortium will have many problems and will have answers for those problems. A consortium which is used to protect the turf defended by its members has fundamental problems which will limit its usefulness to that displayed by the League of Nations.

Occasionally, there may be questions which a particular institution or institutional representative sees clearly and feels are important. However, it may be likely that severe problems would arise if a particular constituency would take a position on that question. In such cases it may be desirable to use either a consultant or a field trip to another project to implant the uncomfortable idea into the consortium's thinking. The decision will still have to be made by the consortium, but a better choice may be possible if the idea, at first, comes from outside.

CONSORTIA: STRIVING TOWARD A UNIFIED PROFESSION

Robert E. Gabrys

With the current emphasis on shared decision making and collaboration to effect improvement in teacher training programs, the word "consortia" is deemed particularly appropriate to define the organizational patterns for teacher education of the future. The term meaning "to unite in company," "to share the same fate" or "partner" is at the core of the new relationships between the various constituencies involved in teacher education. Not only are school districts being asked to participate in university programs, but they are being asked to form a new unit that will assume responsibility for the training process to assure "fate control" over the future of professional trainees.

Rationale:

The concept allows the teaching profession to look at professional education not only as it relates to undergraduate and graduate degree programs but to the total development of the teacher throughout his/her career. Consortia have the potential to play the role of a professional board similar to that which operates in the case of other professions such as law and medicine. Such a unit can allow the profession to establish its own standards, continually assess these standards, and aid its membership in their continuous professional development.

Traditional criticisms of teacher preparation programs have centered on the "ivory tower" thinking of universities, the unreality of the programs, and the firm theoretical basis for training programs that are seldom integrated with field practice. Developing consortia would begin to address these issues.

The movement toward competency-based teacher education only serves to increase the need for collaboration among various members of the profession. In looking at the questions raised by AACTE in reference to competence-based education, one can readily say that the answers must come from the profession at large:

1. What constitutes broad involvement in the design and evaluation of programs?
2. Who speaks for the profession?
3. Who represents the community?

Robert E. Gabrys is Director of Educational Services, School of Education, Syracuse University

4. How specifically should they [competencies] be spelled out?

5. Can performance criteria be established for generic elements of teaching, or must the criteria be detailed specifically?

6. Who should establish criteria?

7. How high should the competency thresholds be? Who is to decide?

8. Can appropriate performance criteria be established in the affective and psychomotor domains?

9. Who assesses teaching performance?

10. How is performance to be assessed?

11. What instruments and procedures are to be used?

These issues directly involve freedom of teachers, accountability, teacher contract negotiations, teachers' responsibility to children, parents, and society, the responsibilities of teacher training institutions and the relationship between theory and practice, and campus and field experiences. Therefore, such questions cannot be answered by one agency. What is needed is a shared decision making system that allows for inputs for all concerned consortia.

The basis for determining teacher competencies would seem to come from three main areas:

1. Tradition

2. Research

3. Professional judgment

The sparcity of research in this area means that a heavy emphasis needs to be placed on professional judgment which necessitates the involvement of the total profession. Tradition will serve to insure constructive change rather than change for the sake of change and forestall the possibility of "throwing out the baby with the bath water."

Basic Concerns in Making Consortia Operational:

1. <u>Participants</u>

Which professionals should be involved in consortia? Why?

a. *Teacher Education Institutions.* It is here that many of the resources, both hardware and software, are available to facilitate the advancement of the profession through the study and analysis of the teaching-learning process, training of prospective teachers in specific skills, and improvement of instruction.

b. *The Practicing Profession.* Teachers should be involved insofar as they are the true test of the realism of the program and most able to supply input concerning the effectiveness of the merging of theory and practice.

c. *The Teacher's Association.* Involvement here is crucial due to the nature of negotiations. As the time approaches when associations will be able to focus less on monetary and fringe benefit issues and become a lobby for improvement of instruction and inservice training, they will be in a position to exercise a leadership role in teacher education.

d. *School District Administration.* It is with the district where the legal responsibility for children lies and it is the district which must lend administrative support in terms of teacher time, and commitment for the Center activities, as well as representing the community.

e. *State Education Department.* The New York State Education Department is committed to providing leadership in the field of teacher preparation and will be seeking widespread support for the CBTE movement in New York State. It, too, should have the opportunity to become involved in consortia.

f. *Students.* Since CBTE carries with it a stress on individualization and response to student needs, it seems appropriate that students share in the decision making process, thereby injecting a degree of "fate control" into the program and assuring response to student needs.

Needless to say, a case could be made for many more constituencies being represented, yet the board must be of a workable size. The case is made for the above representatives having voting power on the board with inputs from many other areas. The board should be committed to seeking views and opinions of various interest groups, e.g. community groups, either when they wish to provide inputs to the board's considerations or when it is appropriate to seek their views.

2. Time and Program

One of the difficulties that has confronted teacher preparation institutions is the total divorce of preservice and inservice programs. The divorce has resulted in the fact that preservice programs have become bound by the time restraints

surrounding undergraduate degree programs. Students expect to graduate in four years and teacher preparation institutions realistically allow no more time than that for training. The movement toward three-year baccalaureate degree programs only serves to heighten the problem.

Consortia must begin to look at preservice and inservice on a continuum. Preservice programs should be competency bound rather than degree bound. If the consortium serves as a professional board which judges competence, the training of teachers can be freed from the semester structure and be looked upon as developmental. No longer would the attainment of a certificate or a baccalaureate degree be viewed as an end of the training program, but rather as a phase in career development.

The danger is that consortia will restrict themselves only to preservice out of fear of confronting the basic issues of teacher renewal because of teacher association and union pressures and thereby drastically restrict their ability to have a significant impact on teaching as a profession.

3. Parity

One of the most difficult concepts related to the notion of consortia is that of parity. If parity is defined as having equal votes in a shared decision-making situation, the term differs little from the concept of consortia and poses only mechanical problems.

If parity is considered as equality in more than mechanical and representational matters, it poses insurmountable problems. Don Bigelow described a consortium as "a group of strange bedfellows..." The fact that a strong power base exists in each of the groups represented in the consortia means that each group will be struggling to represent its own viewpoints. This is not bad *per se*, but reflects a political situation that exists *de facto*. Rather than argue that all groups must be equal, consortia should establish the feeling of confidence in the expertise of each of the constituencies. Truly this is the basis for the consortium - that each constituency has its own particular area of expertise, the totality of which makes up the "profession."

Equality might well exist in the organizational and representational areas, but to presume that all members are equal gives rise to the same problems posed by the U.S. Constitution when it states "all men are created equal." What is the operational definition of such a statement?

Rather, consortia should emphasize that the profession is a conglomerate of various constituencies that join together to form a unit, the whole of which is greater than the sum of its parts. Each group has a particular input and role to play, and the dominance of any one group will fluctuate with the particular input of the issue being considered. If we concern ourselves with accepting the fact that each group has an input that is significant in the light of the total picture, rather than the "equality of constituencies," significant movement and change can occur. To emphasize "equality" would seem to foster "philosophical discussion" but not "change."

4. Legal Responsibility for Certification

Traditionally certification has been the legal responsibility of the State Education Department and this responsibility has been shared with teacher preparation institutions as they have sought to establish "register" or "filed" programs that carried with them both institutional degrees and a recommendation for certification.

If consortia are to establish shared decision making procedures, the responsibility for teacher training must become a shared responsibility, not only programmatically but also legally and financially. Presently higher education institutions must deal with school districts on a "permission" basis: "May we place students in your schools? Will you allow them to have the following experiences?" Schools have tenaciously held on to the notion that the institutions train teachers and use the schools for one component of the program. The clamor for a voice in teacher training all too often means "criticism" of existing university programs, but all too infrequently deals with additional teacher time for working with university students and faculty to improve training programs. Teachers insist on increased payment for participating in such programs since it is not their job to train teachers. They see themselves as working for the university, doing the university's job, rather than as having an opportunity to control and participate in the making of their own future.

School district administrations all too often will not allow inservice programs to be offered during the school day and frown upon released time for teacher development. All of this happens under the guise that teacher education is not the job of the school or is somehow unrelated to the improvement of instruction.

These myths must be demythologized. The job of teacher education must be shared by the profession. Teachers, school districts, professional associations and universities must share in the commitment of time and resources necessary to conduct a collaborative program. Teacher associations need to focus their efforts on negotiating time for teachers to participate in teacher development programs rather than on how many student teachers a teacher may have in a given year.

In other words, the profession must become legally responsible for certifying its members and thereby accountable for itself to the public.

No one group may de-select itself from the profession by rejecting its responsibilities to preserve, improve and foster its own growth. Failure to accept such responsibility means that the teacher will not be viewed as a "professional" but as a technician, and will foster the all too prevalent belief that "anyone (and therefore everyone) is an expert in education."

5. Representation

Insofar as a consortium is composed of a cluster of representatives, a communication problem is inevitable.

Representatives have a tendency to vocalize their own views and biases and hence sometimes fail to truly represent the views of their constituencies.

It is not enough for any group to elect a representative to a seat on the consortium; a communication network must be established to keep everyone abreast of what is happening in relation to the program. Everyone must have the feeling that his views are welcome and will be heard. Associations must truly represent classroom teachers in more ways than providing for physical and safety needs. School district administrators must represent the community. Teacher education institutions must represent the best thinking of their colleagues. Students must be freely able to speak out. State departments of education must actively seek legislation to foster efforts for development programs. A high trust level must be established so that the consortium may serve the real

needs of its constituency - the students'. Hence, the representatives should be constantly reporting to their constituencies and seeking their views and reactions and be held strictly accountable to them.

6. Finances

When one begins to talk about consortia the question of funding is immediately raised. If the consortia were legally responsible for teacher education, more willingness for each of the groups to financially "back" the program might be forthcoming. Every day, teacher centers, trial projects, etc., are in danger of dying from the withdrawal of Federal/state monies.

Consortia should be accountable for maintaining financial solvency rather than relying on "sugar daddies" for their existence.

Not that Federal/state monies should not be applied to consortia, but such monies should be for developmental aspects of the programs rather than maintenance. Priorities must be established and teacher education must rank high in each of the constituencies if the consortia are to be effective. Agencies must literally be asked to make a financial commitment to teacher education if they wish a voice in determining its future.

A public relations campaign should be established to reorient the public to view teacher education in the light of the improvement of instruction which results in improved learning for children. The public then will respond, but also will demand that the profession achieve this end.

The confidence of the public in educators cannot be presupposed, but must be sought after in an organized and honest way. Bond issues fail, not because the public does not believe in schooling, but because schools have failed to demonstrate that teachers do make a difference. Teachers must present the view that they are not only concerned with the needs of individual students, but also that they can effectively respond to those needs. Heart is indeed necessary, but not sufficient.

> The public must see real benefits from schools if it is to continue to pour in millions of dollars each year. So far these benefits are not very visible and perhaps this is the most telling testimony to the need for consortia. Each group has separately tried to design its own programs, fight its own issues, seek constructive change - perhaps by joining forces these efforts will be directed into new channels that will improve learning and thereby gain public support.

An Effort to Establish a Consortium Involving Syracuse University:

Aware of the multiplicity of problems confronting any institution or group of institutions attempting to establish consortia programs, Syracuse University School of Education has undertaken to enter into a partnership with the West Genesee Central School District to establish a consortium entitled: The Teacher Development Center. The Center saw its inception during the 1973-74 school year and has encountered many of the problems previously mentioned. To date, efforts are being made to resolve these obstacles and effect a new unit that will be jointly responsible for the training of preservice and inservice teachers. The most significant characteristics of this Center are:

1. True governance by consortia - manifest by shared decision making in the formulation, development and implementation of pre/inservice programs.

2. The integration of campus and field experiences.

3. The integration of pre-and inservice programs.

4. A Center coordinator who holds faculty rank in both school district and university and who is located in the schools full time.

5. Onsite inservice programs on the basis of teacher self-assessed needs that are primarily supported by tuition benefits accrued through the preservice component.

A detailed description of the Center can be found in Appendix A, entitled: West Genesee Central Schools - Syracuse University Teacher Development Center, Statement of Agreement.

Allowing for the pains of growth, both agencies at this time feel the Center has much to offer the future of the profession and are committed to developing a true partnership teacher education program.

The partners in the consortium have undertaken boldly to break through the barriers of autonomy and distrust to begin to develop a teacher education program that holds the promise of unpredictable yet massive improvement of teacher training which promises to improve the quality of "instruction" and thereby improve learning for students - an ambitious undertaking not meant for the fainthearted, and in which only the strong survive.

COLLABORATION - IT'S WORTH ALL THE PAIN!

Mary Mann

Futurists such as Toffler (1970) and Kahn and Wiener (1967) observe that survival of organizations and mankind very likely depends upon the ability of autonomous entities to come together to achieve common objectives. As society becomes more complex, the interrelationships among once separate subgroups grow. The actions of one group affect more and more outside groups and each is, in turn, affected by the actions of more and more other groups. As is evident in only one example today, the actions of everyone from the Arab nations, our government, and the oil companies to the truck driver, service station owner and the consumer affect each other and ultimately all of us. It is conceivable that the solution to the energy crisis and to further problems may be beyond our reach before interrelated groups feel enough urgency to participate in collaborative planning, decision making and problem solving and, more importantly, to develop the skills necessary to do so.

There have not been and are not many collaborative efforts in existance where decision making is equally shared by autonomous organizations or groups. Such efforts are rarely initiated voluntarily because 1) the thought has not occurred, 2) they are perceived as a threat to existing power and autonomy, 3) of historical rivalries, 4) of a lack of available theory on how to proceed on such a complex course, and/or 5) a strong enough sense or urgency is lacking -- the survival of each organization is not seen to be threatened by the lack of collaboration. If such collaboration is rarely entered into voluntarily but is essential to the achievement of an important objective, perhaps it is necessary that some powerful outside pressure provide the impetus.

SETTING THE STAGE

Actions taken by the New York State Education Department appear to be providing just such an impetus to the collaboration of institutions of higher education, school districts and teachers in the area of teacher education and certification. For its Trial Projects the Department has mandated parity decision making in the design, implementation, evaluation and management of CBTE programs. Moreover, training institutions throughout the State have been informed that they must "functionally involve" school districts and teachers in developing their programs if such programs are to be approved for certification.

The interrelationships of these groups is seen clearly when one reviews some of the following fears, reservations, objections and pressures which converged to draw them together following the public disclosure in 1971-72 of the Regents Statewide Plan for Postsecondary Education:

Mary Mann is Director of the Southern Tier Trial Project in Corning, New York

Colleges and Universities

a) found themselves expected to launch revolutionary new programs when they barely had enough resources to sustain current ones

b) perceived a potential erosion in their preeminent teacher training role

c) questioned basing certification on as yet untested teacher training and assessment procedures

d) feared a loss of academic freedom

e) were reminded of the widespread dissatisfaction with their current training programs and of their powerlessness, vis-à-vis their own inertia, bureaucracies, financial sources, and the State in responding to that criticism.

Teacher Association Leaders

a) feared deterioration of professional standards, prestige and security

b) opposed periodic review for certification maintenance

c) opposed the judging of teacher competency based upon pupil performance

d) objected vehemently to the omission of bargaining agents as the representatives of the profession in training and certification decisions (AFT, 1973; Weinman, 1973; Cortese, 1974)

e) reflected the dissatisfaction of their constituency with the quality of teacher training and of the inadequate knowledge base from which to find solutions to their pedagogical problems (Feldman, 1973)

f) were committed to gaining participation in all decision which affect their profession.

School Administrators

found themselves caught in the triangular bind of

a) mushrooming costs

b) diminishing public commitment to increased financial support for education due in part to a growing "crisis of confidence in our schools" (Jencks, 1974) and leading to greater public demand for accountability--evidence of increased cost-effectiveness

c) accelerating teacher militancy and collective power.

Student Teachers

a) faced a rapidly diminishing market for their services resulting in intense competition for the few available positions

b) questioned the adequacy of their training and felt powerless in affecting and/or identifying necessary changes.

Here we see four beleaguered groups. Certainly, each is affected by outside forces over whom they have little control. However, if one analyzes each listed item it is surprising how many are affected or could be alleviated by combined action with one or more of the other groups. One can only conjecture about the degree of impact they collectively could have upon the aforementioned "outside forces."

It is quite conceivable that the most significant outcome of the PBTE movement will be either the attainment of or the failure to attain shared decision making and problem solving through collaboration rather than new training and certification procedures. It is doubtful that participating groups will continue any form of "functional involvement" in PBTE if that involvement does not grow into equality of influence.

So far the forces cited as promoting a disposition toward collaboration have been defensive or negatively oriented. They do not represent the most important or the most powerful force: the desire of all groups to serve better the children in our schools. Bringing to bear upon this objective the collective expertise and resources of these groups, orchestrated for optimum impact, may be the only way to achieve the illusive "significant difference."

PROBLEMS OF COLLABORATIVE DECISION MAKING IN EDUCATION CONSORTIA

If groups are to increase the odds of achieving collaboration they must learn from what little past experience and research is available to them. It is possible even now, however, to predict some potential problem areas.

In the 60's numerous universities and school districts cooperated in seeking solutions to problems in urban education and to establish cooperatively run teacher centers. Edward T. Ladd has documented some critical sources of tension which arose from collaboration. He sees collaboration existing when "...institutions share the responsibility for decision-making in certain significant areas, i.e., spending of sizeable amounts of money, the setting of policy on matters of consequence, the making of curriculum decisions, and the recruiting and appointment of staff." He continues, "...the sharing may take the form of a confederative relationship, in which each party retains the right of veto over decisions: less commonly, it involves turning over a certain area of decision-making to joint control, most often for a specified length of time." (Ladd, 1969, p. 3)

Ladd sees major sources of tension resulting from the necessity of "accepting increased possibilities of exposure, developing new arrangements and learning new habits, giving up old ways of doing things, and confronting differences which may cause misunderstanding or even resentment." (Ladd, 1960, p. 7) Of particular importance is the arduous task of formulating joint decision-making procedures requiring the acceptance of new colleagues and learning new roles in relation to them. When the need for new procedures is overlooked the possibility of unremediable misunderstandings can result.

There is most often little appreciation from participants, let alone those whom they represent, for the complexity and crucial importance of establishing and implementing shared decision making procedures. Important skills must be learned if this is to be accomplished. Such training takes precious time and effort when the focus is generally upon the purpose of the collaboration rather than upon the problems of collaboration itself.

"Frequently, those who become involved in collaboration learn too late how complex an equilibrium the other organization is, and how much time and effort will have to be expended before it has changed." (Ladd, 1969, p. 10) Additional tensions may result because "persons in one institution may misunderstand the other institutions' capabilities, purposes, organizational procedures, behavior, language, or other subcultural characteristics." (Ladd, 1969, p. 11)

Individuals may have difficulty acknowledging the expertise of those outside their own group. One group may consider itself of higher or lower status than another, fostering either a resistance to inputs from "inferiors" or a defensiveness toward "superiors."

The interests of one group may be endangered by the serving of the interests of another. When resources and power are in short supply the competition for maintaining or increasing one's share of each can become intense among groups.

Constant is the fear of losing the autonomy of one's organization. Each group seeks, if anything, to increase rather than decrease its own independence. If it is perceived that this can only be done at the expense of another group within the consortium, tension will increase. Mulder has hypothesized that power does not necessarily remain intact in participative decision making; "When there are large differences in the expert power of members of a system, an increase in participation will increase the power differences between members." (Mulder, 1971, p. 34) Thus, he concludes that shared decision making is only effective among groups in which differences in expertise is not too great. Differences in political power, commitment, perception of the significance of the purpose of the consortia, impact of the results upon individual members, and resources available to each group to bring to bear upon the joint endeavor are all also potential hazards to achieving and/or maintaining a power balance.

In a consortium which includes more than one separate institution within each representative group such as four colleges, three separate teachers unions and the administrations of three school districts and two BOCES as one might envision in a New York State PBTE consortium, tensions can arise within groupings from historical rivalries, vested interests, territorial considerations, jurisdictional questions, differences in philosophy, personality conflicts and power struggles. These factors are compounded if representatives selected to represent any one of the groups do not, in fact, have the power to speak for that group. As an example, we in the Southern Tier Trial Project feel that it has been most fortuitous for us to have defined teachers as member of teacher bargaining agencies. Teacher representatives are thus chosen by their union.

Ever present are the following twin scourges: lack of money and, therefore, lack of time. The expectations of participants and those whom they represent can rarely be realistically met with the scarce resources available. Compounding this problem is the dilemma of deciding how to best spend what little time there is: On the task? Or on building collaborative procedures? If the first is not done the group's morale will suffer from the lack of reinforcement only tangible results can give and from vulnerability to criticism from the outside. If the second is not done adequately tensions and misunderstandings may grow to the point of paralyzing or destroying the consortia.

As if all this is not enough, communication problems can provide the coup de grace. As the effort gains momentum more and more people will have to be apprised of more and more information which is becoming more and more incommunicable while more and more time is necessary to

accomplish what is becoming more and more complicated. Great effort must be expended to avoid a phenomenom often present in any endeavor carried on by representatives: when a collaborative effort is one leading to innovative practices and political arrangements, the participants who have been intimately and continuously involved in planning and implementing change undergo modifications in their attitudes, philosophy and conceptual level which may possibly create communication difficulties between them and those whom they represent. A new subculture may be created and loyalties may shift engendering suspicion from those not participating. Mulder, in commenting on this phenomenon notes that a "danger which always exists in procedures involving participation through representatives...., is that these representatives from an elite, and most members of the organization resign from actual participation." (Mulder, 1971, p. 36)

To the fainthearted, or perhaps to the realist, simply to be forewarned of these tensions may be enough to discourage any attempt at collaboration. Let me say that in the Southern Tier Trial Project and many others of which I am familiar every one of these roadblocks have been enountered at least to some degree. As a result, we have each learned much about ourselves and the others with whom we collaborate, have overcome each setback gaining each time new skills which lessen the impact of successive inter-organizational problems and, most importantly, we are more cohesive than ever before and more determined that the quality of our outcomes will justify the efforts we have expended.

AN IDEA WHOSE TIME IS COMING

Why would any group of autonomous organizations even consider sharing decision making? If they perceived that through a collaborative effort 1) their power and influence would be enhanced, 2) they could achieve organizational goals which they cannot in isolation, and/or 3) a threat to their continued existence could be overcome, sharing decision making would become more palatable. When those factors fostering alliances are perceived as stronger than those countervailing forces, obstacles, and possible threats which must be overcome, an organization becomes more predisposed toward collaboration.

Organizationl theory is evolving in the direction of viewing the organization as an open system intricately related to its environment. As opposed to the earlier closed system theory attention thus shifts "from goal achievement to survival, and incorporates uncertainty by recognizing organizational interdependence with environment." (Thompson, 1973, p. 35) Here, organizations are aware that they have effect outside their boundaries and that their actions may have unintended consequences. In turn, they are conditioned by, and their activities may be adversely or positively affected by, other organizations or publics upon whom they are dependent. (Thompson, 1973, p. 33) As the awareness on the part of an organization develops that its decisions cannot be made and effectively carried out in isolation from others, there is an increasing disposition to include in decision making those other entities who will be affected, those which will affect their own internal policies, and those whose support is necessary to the implementation of decisions.

WHY COLLABORATION IN PBTE?

Through collaboration any problem solving effort 1) has access to a wider range expertise, experience, information and resources, 2) tends to produce more adequate decisions, 3) is more likely to gain the commitments necessary to the implementation of its decisions and 4) increases the odds that its decisions will, in fact, be implemented. All of these possibilities are of extreme importance in PBTE. The task is complex and requires all of the resources available from throughout the educational community. The problem solving necessary in the areas of planning, development, evaluation and management is possibly the most sophisticated ever attempted in education. The implementation of programs requires the cooperation and coordination of everyone from classroom teacher, college faculty, school administrators to student teachers, and that cooperation is not likely if there has not been developed in these groups a sense of ownership for the program. There is much in the literature to support this contention.

The requirments of the Performance/Competency-Based Teacher Education movement necessitate collaboration because of the kinds of decisions which must be made in both the development and implementation of PBTE programs. The goal of an equal partnership is either implicit or explicit in the various CBTE efforts throughout the country and the term "parity" is used to describe such partnerships.

What typically might be an issue best resolved by consortia currently involved in the movement? Certainly, any consortium developing a PBTE program at this time has one crucial decision to make in terms of its focus: Traditionally, candidates have been judged ready to enter the profession when they are able to give evidence that they possess "knowledge of subject matter, teaching methods, children's learning, and so forth--as measured by course grades" (Schalock, 1971, p. 43) and the accumulation of credit hours. In PBTE the question is, shall assessment be focused upon the demonstration of the achievement of specified teaching behaviors which are at this time only assumed to be related to pupil outcomes, or on the demonstration of the ability to bring about specific learner outcomes (product orientation)? (Schalock, 1971, pp. 44-48) The latter implies a strong research commitment.

Feldman argues for the latter focus in research when she says, "We should be making a coordinated, long-term commitment to validating teacher competencies--not what is being done, which is a short-term commitment to listing them. We should be working at providing what teacher behavior, what teaching strategies, affect what learning, and how." (Feldman, 1973, pp. 4-5)

In the absence of established relationships between teaching competence and pupil learning, McDonald identifies the problem in a question addressed to those preparing teachers: "Given your conception of what constitutes competence, what evidence have you gathered that demonstrates that teachers have acquired these competencies?" (McDonald, 1973, p. 16)

The training institutions cannot take it upon themselves to determine whether the focus of an individual effort should be upon teacher behaviors or learner outcomes, nor can they develop and implement PBTE programs in isolation. Alone, they do not have access to the power, the classrooms, the people, the resources--all of the inputs and support that are essential. It follows that the "...identification of mechanisms which focus the power of all sources on common objectives is essential for the institutionalization of change in teacher education." (Rosner, 1972, p. 98)

Care must be taken to avoid the illusion of a true partnership. Elfenbein, after observing many operational PBTE programs concluded that "much remains to be done in the development of total professional responsibility for the education of teachers. It becomes quite apparent that for the majority of programs major control and decision-making is exercised by the college and its members. The college personnel generally determine organization, selection, instruction, linkage, management and cybernation, often with the recommendations of school districts." (Elfenbein, 1972, p. 47)

The objective setting, program development, implementation and monitoring necessary in PBTE all require creative group problem solving under conditions of uncertainty and ambiguity. Luce and Raiffa conclude that much of educational decision making is decision under uncertainty and that under such conditions groups can make more adequate decisions than individuals. (Luce, 1957, p. 13)

In PBTE it is hoped that more adequate decisions will be made by representatives of various groups rather than by an individual group. Because of this it is even more important that participants become skilled in decision making. In his review of the literature on the effectiveness of group decisions, Lake concludes that the research "argues quite directly that if adequate steps are taken to insure information processing, cohesiveness, and careful definition of the task, effective problem solving will result" and "When consensus decision-making is employed by groups who have skills in utilizing the dynamics of conflict, interpersonal sensitivity, and internal group power, more adequate decisions will result." (Lake, 1971, p. 19)

Not only does the quality of decisions improve through broad participation but so does the likelihood that those who must carry them out will be committed to doing so. Especially when the organization is pursuing an innovative course, the need to develop ownership for the innovation within those entities both directly and indirectly affected becomes a crucial concern. The necessary modifications in behavior and attitude to facilitate change are best accomplished by including in the decision-making process those persons and/or groups who must themselves change. This principle is expostulated in the literature under the rubric "participation hypothesis" (Golembiewski, 1965, pp. 117-20) and was earlier described by Simon, who noted that "significant changes in human behavior can be brought about rapidly only if the persons who are expected to change participate in deciding what the change shall be and how it shall be made." (Simon, 1955, pp. 28-29)

Not to be overlooked in any accounting of the attributes of collaboration is the potential for greater accumulative power which in PBTE can be brought to bear upon both participating and outside agencies toward the improvement of training, licensure, and ultimately the schools. As an example, the education faculty of a college may not be able alone to move its own administration to make desired changes where the collective influence of student, teachers' unions and school districts might....

SOME GUIDELINES ACCRUED THROUGH EXPERIENCE

There is no question that conflicts will arise in PBTE consortia, conflicts with graver implications than most previously experienced by participants. In addition, there will develop a whole raft of problems, some of which have been never before encountered. In order to avoid or minimize potential conflicts and problems it may be useful to new collaborators to consider some suggestions from others who have the distinction of having already made every mistake possible:

1) clarify from the beginning who speaks for whom and with what authority to commit resources, support, cooperation, etc.

2) invest time early in establishing the most efficient and equitable operating, decision making, and problem solving procedures. Find out what has worked for other similar groups.

3) provide continuing training in interpersonal skills, problem solving, decision making, group process and team building along with those skills necessary to the accomplishment of program tasks.

4) do not concentrate exclusively on your program at the expense of developing cooperative procedures, as you may find yourselves unable to cooperate in the implementation of that program. On the other hand, do not become bogged down with haggling endlessly over procedures, as you may never get to the point of having any purpose for those procedures.

5) clarify as much as possible both long-range and short-range objectives with designations of responsibility. Set up a time frame for each objective including detailed procedures and procure commitment to both from all concerned.

6) keep all constituents informed and work toward procuring their ownership for both the objectives and the product.

7) be realistic with yourselves and your constituencies about a) the complexity of the undertaking, b) the fact that much of your important accomplishment will be intangible, c) the time and effort necessary to attain each objective, and d) the calibre of the final product which can be expected considering the resources, time, expertise, knowledge base, etc. at the project's disposal.

8) attempt in every way possible to foresee the ramifications of each decision and resulting action. Plan for dealing with those ramifications.

9) allow working time "away" with adequate opportunity for socializing. Personal friendships will serve the consortia well when a) vested interests come in conflict, b) morale takes a dip (as will frequently happen), c) setbacks are experienced, d) the going gets rough and e) misunderstandings arise. In other words, when support is needed, your greatest support must come from each other.

10) do not underestimate the collective power of the consortium--do not be of faint heart.

11) involve as many affected people as you can.

12) constantly pursue any possibility to procure initial and/or additional funding--do not overlook any potential source both from participating and from outside sources. Remember, the more financial support you can procure from participating agencies the greater will be their commitment, but also the greater will be their expectation for tangible outcomes.

REFERENCES

American Federation of Teachers, 1973 National Convention Resolution, No. 77.

Cortese, Antonia, "Is Performance-Based Teacher Education (PBTE) Inevitable?" The New York Teacher, Jan. 6, 1974, p. 9.

Elam, Stanley. Performance-Based Teacher Education: What is the State of the Art? Washington, D.C. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. 1971.

Elfenbein, Iris M. Performance-Based Teacher Education Programs: A Comparative Description. Washington, D.C. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. 1972.

Feldman, Sandra. Paper presented to the Multi-State Consortium on PBTE at the American Educational Research Association Convention, New Orleans. 1973.

Golembiewski, Robert T. "Small Groups and Large Organizations." in March J. G. Ed. Handbook of Organizations. Rand McNally & Co. 1965. pp. 87-141.

Jencks, Christopher, "Schooling Has Limits," The New York Times, January 16, 1974, p. 57 & 56.

Kahn, Herman and Wiener, Anthony J. The Year 2000. The MacMillan Co. London. 1967.

Ladd, Edward T. "Sources of Tension in School-University Collaboration." ERIC, ED 031-434.

Lake, Dale G. "Participation in Decision-Making." Performance-Based Certification of School Personnel. ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education. Washington, D.C. 1971. SP 004-632.

Luce, R. D., and Raiffa. Games and Decisions. Wiley. New York. 1957.

McDonald, Frederick J. "The State of the Art in Performance Assessment of Teaching Competence." A paper presented to the Multi-State Consortium on PBTE. New Orleans. 1973.

Mulder, Mauk. "Power Equalization through Participation?" in Administrative Science Quarterly. Cornell University. March, 1971

Rosner, Benjamin. The Power of Competency-Based Teacher Education: A Report. Allyn & Bacon, Inc. Boston, Mass. 1972.

Schalock, H. Del. "BEPD, NCERD, and Teacher Education that Makes a Demonstrable Difference." The Power of Competency-Based Teacher Education: A Report. Rosner, Benjamin, ed. Allyn & Bacon, Inc. Boston, Mass. 1972, pp. 109-183.

Schmieder, Allen A. Competency-Based Education: The State of the Scene. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Washington, D.C. 1973.

Thompson, James D. "Strategies for Studying Organizations" from Contingency Views of Organization and Management. Kast & Rosenziveig, eds. Science Research Associates. Chicago. 1973. pp. 26-36.

Toffler, Alvin. Future Schock. Random House. 1970.

Weinman, Gloris, "PBTE/C in New York State," Quality Educational Standards in Teaching Consortium Yearbook, 1973. pp. 154-156.

APPENDIX A

WEST GENESEE CENTRAL SCHOOLS - SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

TEACHER DEVELOPMENT CENTER

Statement of Agreement

Statement

It is the recommendation of the investigating committee that the West Genesee School District enter into an agreement for the establishment of a Teacher Training Center jointly conducted by the faculties of Syracuse University and West Genesee. The directorship of such a program would be a person jointly selected and equally funded by the two participating institutions.

We feel that to enter into such an agreement allows for an opportunity to fulfill the professional obligation to the pre-service training of teachers. Although we have been involved for years in traditional student teaching arrangements with universities, under these arrangements we have not had the authority to enter into the development of the training program. Under the agreement with Syracuse University we would not only have the authority but we would have the responsibility to initiate the development of a training program that we feel fits the needs of incoming teachers. It would allow us to really have a voice in the experiences that the university students would be exposed to. This agreement would give us an opportunity to venture into on-site and action research into the application of the theory and practices of higher education as they can be administered and incorporated into the "real world" of the public school.

Through the director and building administrator the training and experiences of students could be individualized by providing for them a multiplicity of assignments. Through the multiple assignments we would be able to expand and increase our skills in the area of multiple evaluation. Through the evaluations of the faculty members being involved with an individual student, the director would have more inputs upon which to base a final evaluation.

A multiple assignment program would enable us to involve not only the tenured, experienced teacher but also the new, non-tenured teacher. By involving the non-tenured teacher we would be providing the reinforcement and an access to the needs that they feel they must have in order to improve professionally. This improvement in the professional competency of the teaching staff both tenured and non-tenured can only result in the upgrading and continual increasing of the teaching standards and methods of the West Genesee School District.

The entering into such an agreement can act as a unifying force not only within individual buildings but also within the total district. As we look at trends within education we see that this is a coming trend, that school districts will be entering into agreements with universities. It is our feeling that here we have an opportunity to be among the first in our area to participate in this trend. We think that it is a tribute to the total staff of West Genesee that Syracuse University is pursuing us as a partner. This perhaps can provide the status and prestige that we all feel is deserving to the people that have contributed to making West Genesee the outstanding educational leader we consider it to be.

Such an arrangement, through the reciprocal monetary arrangements that would be established, would provide West Genesee with funds for running such staff development programs as individual in-service programs within a building and the opportunity to provide the staff the professional consultants that are many times necessary for motivation and reinforcement to move new programs ahead. It further may provide the opportunity to bring into West Genesee, at a much reduced cost, training programs that the present staff may utilize for their own individual professional growth. The entering into such an agreement would also provide, through the Syracuse University students, the many hands that our staff requires and is asking for in order to provide for students the individualization of instruction, the enrichment and remediation programs that we feel so necessary for not only individual students but small groups of students. The students would enable us to provide opportunities at not only the secondary level but the elementary level for independent study programs for our students and for us to further develop the potential of the resource centers in our buildings.

It is our further recommendation that all of the vouchers accrued under the system be placed into a pool. There are many possibilities as to the utilization of the vouchers within the pool. The only stipulation that we would have at this time would be that if a student was assigned to an individual faculty member for an 8-week duration of time, that member would automatically be granted an individual voucher. This does not eliminate the possibility that individual teachers working in the system could apply for an individual voucher from the pool. We recommend that a directing council, which would include the coordinator, teachers, administrators and university students, be established to act on the requests for individual vouchers.

Purpose

The general purpose of the Teacher Development Center is to achieve a joint sovereignty for teacher education shared by the University and West Genesee Central School District. More specific purposes are to:

a) design, implement and evaluate model teacher education programs cooperatively

b) integrate theory and practice, the on-campus with the off-campus, and the pre-service with the in-service

c) articulate the theoretical teacher education faculty (college) with the clinical teacher education faculty (school) in such ways that they work together in teams at the same time, in the same place, on common instruction and supervisory problems

d) work jointly on improvement of instructional programs provided to the District's students through making available University personnel, as consultants to Center staff meetings, workshops, seminars

e) analyze objectively and systematically what goes on in the classroom and to develop specific goal-oriented strategies for teaching and supervision

f) eliminate the gap between pre-service and in-service teacher training

g) individualize professional development -- for pre-professionals as well as for practicing professionals

h) utilize educational technology, micro-teaching, and cognitive and affective systems for analyzing teaching

Organized Structure

The specific activities unique to the Teaching Center which will be jointly planned and administered by the two institutions are:

1) Pre-service activities whose purpose is the preparation of College of Education students for productive and successful careers as teachers;

2) In-service activities designed to promote growth in teacher education effectiveness on the part of all professional personnel;

3) Program development sufficient to effectively accomplish 1 and 2 above.

Both institutions must have an active involvement in the planning, development, and administration of the Center. The agencies and activities through which this is to be accomplished are as follows:

Directing Council

Composition of Council will be:

Center:	Coordinator
District:	Assistant Superintendent/Instruction, three building administrators, and three staff representatives
University:	Dean of School of Education, Assistant Dean of Teacher Education, Director of Redesign, Coordinator of Field Experiences, two University representatives, and one student

Function:

The purpose of the Council is to facilitate the cooperative involvement on the part of Center professional staffs and the faculty of the College, as well as to provide an operational policy development body for guiding the operations of the Center. The agenda for committee meetings will be prepared cooperatively by the Coordinator of Field Experiences, the Assistant Superintendent, and the Center Coordinator. No topic is to be considered beyond the realm of possible consideration by this committee. Topics identified by individuals or groups should be submitted to the Center Coordinator who will assign such topics to ad hoc committees for study. After study by the ad hoc committees, the items should be submitted to the agenda committee for inclusion on the agenda. Whenever possible, agenda items should be presented for information and discussion at one meeting and then presented at the following meeting for further discussion and action. Issues shall be worked through to a position that is acceptable to a two-thirds majority of the members present. A quorum of ten members is necessary for a vote to be taken.

The recommendations of the Committee should be directed to: a) the Center Coordinator, b) the Coordinator of Field Experiences and/or the Assistant Superintendent for action when necessary or for information, or to c) the Directing Council as deemed necessary and appropriate by the Committee.

The Council will meet monthly on a designated schedule. Other meetings may be held as needed. The Coordinator will serve as chairman. The schedule of meetings for the Directing Council shall be prepared and distributed to the members at the first meeting of each school year. The Council may appoint or approve ad hoc committees, including building level committees, as needed.

Program Description

The teaching center concept encompasses both pre-service and in-service staff development. Both the pre-service and in-service components consist of intensive and extensive experiences.

In general, the Teacher Center is a vehicle and a place where individuals and/or teams of individuals can focus on the study of teaching and learning and can, through formal and informal means, become better and more effective teachers of children as well as better and more effective teachers of teachers.

In-Service

The in-service component will consist of both a formal and informal component. The formal componet would consist of graduate courses or workshops that relate to teacher assessed needs. These formal programs would be offered outside the time of the school day.

In contrast, the informal in-service would consist of individual assistance to teachers that would aid them in developing and implementing their classroom plans. One day of mini-programs designed for and with groups of teachers might also constitute a part of the informal inservice. In order that teachers may be able to take advantage of such activities, advanced pre-service students, when judged competent, may take charge of the class for short periods of time. However, these pre-service students would not be considered as substitute teachers or used in such a capacity. So as not to conflict with the normal school operations, the informal in-service will be of an individualized nature and relate the current classroom and Center activities. University personnel will be available to assist in program planning and development as this work is carried on in the school district and requested by principals and teachers.

Inservice education will proceed along five main lines. First, Syracuse University will provide course vouchers commensurate with the current University policy on voucher issuance. At present, this policy provides one voucher for each full-time student teacher for each eight-week assignment. Presently, vouchers are not available for pre-student teachers' field experiences. It is expected that approximately 20 students and 20 vouchers will be involved in the Center each semester.

1. These vouchers will be pooled by the Center and assigned by the Directing Council of the Center for use for Center in-service activities and for use by individual Center staff. A list of in-service activities and Center teachers to whom

vouchers have been allocated will be presented to the Director of Field Services three weeks prior to the end of each semester.

2. Teachers assigned vouchers may use the voucher to take an on-campus University course.

3. Specially designed courses may be offered. These courses will be provided for staff.

4. Courses will be offered at the Center upon request of the Center staff. These courses will be paid for by vouchers.

5. Inservice workshops, mini-courses, demonstrations, etc., that relate to improvement of teaching skills or the on-going program for children in the school, may be offered. These activities will be staffed by Center and University personnel.

6. Credit courses may be paid for on a one-to-one basis by vouchers. Opportunities for independent study credit are available using the workshops as the starting point for the study.

Pre-Service

The pre-service component of the Center is designed to provide a personalized and individualized field experience program for the University student. The Coordinator of Field Experiences at the University will work in conjunction with the Center Coordinator and the principals of the Center schools to decide the number of students and criteria for entrance of students into the Center for their field experiences. The students will be assigned to the Center by the University Office of Field Experiences and the specifics of the field experience placement within the Center will be worked out by the principals and Coordinator, classroom teachers and University personnel. For field experiences outside the Center schools, arrangements will be made through the Center Coordinator and the Coordinator of Field Experiences. By assigning students to the Center for their field experiences, the Center teachers will share with University personnel in building an individualized set of experiences for each of the students that may draw upon the strengths of all teachers within the Center schools. Students will spend varying amounts of time with teachers in the participating schools dependent upon the needs of the students' program. This will mean a new configuration of short and long term field experience placements depending upon the needs and resources of the Center.

Not all of the experience will involve classroom experiences or direct contact with children. Students will engage in seminars, independent study and materials examinations and development at the Center.

Operating Structure

The implementation of the regular school program for children, as well as the implementation of the Teacher Development Center activities, requires an operational structure or organization in each school which facilitates achievement of the goals of each activity of the Center. The regular operating organization of the school as it pertains to provision of instructional program for children will continue to be the responsibility of the school principal.

In relationship to the Teacher Development Center, personnel will be involved in varying degrees with the following functions:

a) Providing a strong instructional program for children by utilizing additional resources available through the Center

b) Providing clinical experiences for individual pre-service students

c) Providing supervision and guidance to pre-service students

d) Sharing professional, practical, and theoretical information with pre-service students

e) Developing model teacher education program activities in the Center

f) Conducting inservice activities for staff members related to improving teaching and supervisory skills

g) Participating in the Directing Council in furtherance of Teacher Development Center goals.

Center Personnel

Directing the specialized program in the Teacher Development Center is a full-time coordinator who is jointly selected and employed by the School System and the University. His role in general is to bring together in cooperative and creative ways the personnel and material resources of the School System and the University in ways that will produce effective laboratory experience programs for the University students

assigned to Center, enhance quality of children's programs, and provide reality-oriented inservice programs for the Center teachers who work with these students. Stationed in the Center schools, he is in constant contact with and serves as a continuing resource to both the students and the Center teachers. He is equally and simultaneously a staff member of both the University and the School System. In coordinating the pre-service and in-service programs, he unifies the interest, resources, and ambitions of both institutions and enhances the attainment of mutual objectives.

The Center coordinator does not serve as a direct arm of the administrative or supervisory services of any particular school building. The building principal is responsible for overall administration and supervision of his unit. The coordinator is stationed in the Center schools; there he is easily reached and can act as a constant resource for both the pre-service and in-service professionals. He will coordinate the supervisory efforts in the Center and assume major responsibility for the general supervision of the pre-service students. Specialized supervisory services are provided by the university and pubic school academic supervisors to aid in supervision and evaluation of pre-service students. The building principal will be responsible, as usual, for supervision and evaluation of building staff. Within his area(s) of competencies, the coordinator can assume such specialized supervisory responsibilities for pre-service students as seem appropriate to his time and talents. He may also become involved in the teaching of methods or other related teacher education courses as the needs of the program and/or the time and talents of the coordinator may dictate.

The building principal in a Teacher Development Center, while assuming the conventional role of being the leadership person for the overall instructional program of his school, also assumes another role, namely, that of creating an environment wherein the teacher education program can operate effectively and harmoniously as an important part of the total school program. His role is one of facilitating the job of the Teacher Development Center coordinator; of encouraging total staff involvement in programs of professional development; and of promoting program development and evaluation.

Role Description

In carrying out his role the principal:

1. Is responsible for the total school, on-going program.

2. Makes it possible for the regular program and the Center program to operate effectively and harmoniously in the same building -- one supporting and enhancing the other.

3. Is responsible for total staff development program in the school. Will delegate major responsibility for staff development of Center team members to the coordinator.

4. Seeks out staff for teaching responsibilities who will have the interest and the abilities to support the teacher education aspect of the school program.

5. Keeps informed of current trends in teacher education.

6. Works cooperatively with the Center staff assigned to the building.

7. Confers regularly with the coordinator keeping him informed of current and foreseen situations.

8. Evaluates the on-going programs of the Center and makes recommendations to the appropriate parties.

9. Consults with the coordinator in terms of staff and program needs.

In carrying out his role, the Center Coordinator:

1. Works with the principal in furnishing leadership in the new development of the Center, including assisting in the selection of new Center staff and pre-service students.

2. Is responsible for coordinating the decision-making process -- not for formulating decisions unilaterally.

3. Carries out policy decisions as they relate to pre-service and in-service education.

4. Orients university pre-service students to the Center schools.

5. Schedules and conducts seminars for pre-service teachers assigned to the Center.

6. Works with the principal coordinating assignments and activities of students assigned to the Center. Arranges for the intensive and extensive experiences of pre-service students.

7. Assists each prospective teacher in evolving a teaching role comfortable for him and appropriate to the learning situation.

8. Supervises all pre-service students assigned to the Center.

9. Evaluates pre-service students' performance and writes recommendations.

10. Assesses the needs of students and the staff of the Center regarding teacher education and then uses school and university resources most appropriate in terms of these needs.

11. Coordinates the in-service staff development program for teacher education as part of the larger, overall staff development of the school, which is the responsibility of the principal.

12. Guides Center teachers in supervisory techniques of working with pre-service students.

13. Works with the principal in exercising leadership in introducing programs and techniques.

14. Works closely with school principal(s) in coordinating the pre-service teacher program to be consistent with the school philosophy.

15. Constantly evaluates the on-going teacher education program and makes recommendations to the School System and the University.

16. Serves on various committees which aid in forming policy and operational tasks for the Teacher Development Center.

17. Serves as liaison person among all parties.

18. Keeps informed of current developments in teacher education.

19. Helps interpret the Teacher Development Center program to educators and laymen.

20. Coordinates resource consultant's services (clinic, laboratory, etc.)

21. Works with principal to provide for planning and conference time for teachers.

22. Assists in systematic evaluation of model teacher education programs.

In carrying out his role the Center teacher:

1. Provides instructional program for pupils in his charge.

2. Continues to grow in classroom teaching in the broader aspects of education, in curriculum and program development.

3. Develops skills in personalized and individualized clinical supervision.

4. Develops human relations and team skills.

5. Demonstrates selected teaching skills, techniques and program.

6. Becomes acquainted and able to operate with the concept of the Teacher Development Center and a modularized, competency-based teacher education program.

7. Keeps informed of current developments in education and teacher education.

8. Makes recommendations for program improvement.

9. Assesses selected competencies.

10. Aids in evaluating center, program materials, and instructional sequences.

11. Provides assignments and pupils for micro-teaching.

12. Provides general diagnosis, area of concern and pupils for tutoring.

Institutional Responsibilities

Personnel

West Genesee Central School District will support or provide:

a) School principals and participating Center staff

b) One-half cost of coordinator's salary

c) One-half cost of secretary's salary

Syracuse University will support or provide:

a) College specialists and consultants

b) One-half cost of coordinator's salary

c) Pre-service students

d) One-half cost of secretary's salary

e) Vouchers for inservice and Center staff use

f) University personnel to conduct informal seminars and workshops

Space and Equipment

West Genesee Central School District will provide:

a) Office for Coordinator and secretary

b) Sufficient pre-service field situations

c) Share whatever resources and media that are available in the District

Syracuse University will:

a) Provide whatever resources and media are available to the University, including films and personnel

Selections and Retention of Pre-service Students

Students will be offered as candidates for the Center by Syracuse University. The selection of these candidates to be students at the Center will be the responsibility of the building principal and the Coordinator. Placement of students will be done cooperatively by the Coordinator and the Center staff.

Students will be expected to deport themselves as teachers on the Center staff. Students involved in experiences will follow the general regulations and procedures pertaining to teachers, including attending team and faculty meetings. The ultimate responsibility for the evaluation of the students' field experiences is the responsibility of the Coordinator.

Implementation of the Agreement

The Center will be implemented by approval by the West Genesee

Central School System's Board of Education and the Administration of Syracuse University.

It is expected that the Center will be operational September, 1973. A coordinator will be available prior to the opening of the Center in order to prepare for its opening. The number of students in the Center has been worked out mutually by Syracuse University and the West Genesee Central Schools and is to be approximately 20 students per semester.

Evaluation, Review, and Future Goals

Program of the Center is the final responsibility of the Directing Council. A quarterly progress report shall be presented to them by the Coordinating Committee.

The Center staff, administration, and coordinator are to constantly evaluate the procedures and effectiveness of the Center and its programs.

The Center will be evaluated in the areas of: a) effect on children, b) effect on instructional program, c) pre-service component, d) status of implementation of model for Center, and e) cost.

The first full year of operation will be considered a trial year for both institutions. Thereafter the Center will be considered an ongoing agreement with continuous evaluation. The agreement can be terminated by either party for sufficient reason with due notice.

Selection of Center Coordinator

Recommendations for the position of coordinator will originate from the Directing Council and be given directly to the Superintendent and Dean of the School of Education.

The coordinator's position is described above. He will be employed for eleven months per year. He will be supported equally by the School District and the University. Administratively, he will be employed by the system which most nearly fits his background and career goals. The salary will be in accordance with the established salary scale of the employing institution and at the appropriate level of the individual being employed.

This joint appointee is not to serve as an arm of the administrator or supervisory services of any particular school building but, while working in close cooperation with these services, would serve as an extension of the superintendent of schools and the dean of the college of education.

APPENDIX B

CONSTITUTION OF THE CITE PROJECT

CITE - Member Agencies

College representatives from:	Manhattanville College Pace University SUC New Paltz Teachers College, Columbia University
College student representatives from:	Manhattanville College Pace University SUC New Paltz Teachers College, Columbia University
School District representatives from:	Greenburgh Central Schools Putnam/Westchester BOCES Somers Central Schools Yorktown Central Schools
Teacher representatives from:	Greenburgh Central Schools Somers Central Schools Yorktown Central Schools
Community representatives from:	Greenburgh Central Schools Somers Central Schools Yorktown Central Schools

Preamble

As citizens and educators concerned with the quality of American education, and committed to its improvement by increasing the competence of educational personnel through cooperative efforts, we do hereby adopt this Constitution:

Article I. Name, Goals, Objectives and Governance.

Section 1. Name. The name of this organization shall be the CITE Project, Cooperation in Teacher Education in the Putnam and Westchester Counties.

Section 2. Goals. The goals of the CITE Project are (1) the cooperative development and (2) continuous assessment by colleges, schools and communities of a (3) competency-based program for the (4) preparation, induction, and certification of elementary teachers. The organizational structure provided by this Constitution shall have the necessary power to take action for the attainment of the goals.

Section 3. Specific objectives in the pursuance of the stated goals reflect CITE's commitment to a cooperative process which involves (1) the identification of objectives and determination of priorities of the schools involved, (2) the translation of those objectives into teacher competencies, (3) the design of components of teacher education programs and (4) the development of tools for assessing teacher performance. Additional objectives may be periodically established in the Bylaws of this Constitution as the CITE Project moves toward other cooperative training ventures.

Section 4. Governance. The CITE Project shall be governed by its Constitution and by the Bylaws and such actions as the General Assembly may take consistent with them.

Article II. Membership. Membership in the CITE Project shall include those agencies responsible for and affected by the Project. Membership is initially limited to those educational and community agencies that originally responded to an invitation to join the Project and subsequently participated in preliminary activities. In order to preserve the broad representative nature of the project, membership shall reflect a balance among the participating agencies. Other agencies must apply to the Executive Board for membership. Full or part-time membership of new agencies will require a two-thirds affirmative vote of the full Executive Board conducted by mail ballot, and providing a Resolution of Commitment has been accepted. Any agency may withdraw membership upon written notification to the Director of CITE following approval of withdrawal by the governing board or administrator of the agency.

a. Full membership. Those agencies, including subcategories, that have signed, or have been included in an authorized signature, a Resolution of Commitment as provided by the Executive Board indicating continuous commitment to all phases of the Project.

b. Part-time membership. An agency or individual participating on a limited, or part-time, basis for special tasks that have specified time and/or participatory limits. Such members may seek selective or appointive non-voting positions in the CITE organizational structure upon written request to the Executive Board.

Article III. General Assembly.

Section 1. Meetings. The General Assembly shall meet semiannually in May and November. Additional meetings may be called by: 1. a majority of Executive Board members voting at an Executive Board meeting; 2. a majority of Executive Board members presenting a signed petition to the Chairman of the Executive Board; or, 3. petition signed by official delegates of three member agencies and presented to the Chairman of the Executive Board.

Section 2. Composition and Selection. The General Assembly shall be composed of one official delegate from each participating agency except as noted in the Bylaws. The delegates shall be chosen by the Active

members of each agency. Additional non-voting delegates chosen by each agency may attend the General Assembly meetings.

Section 3. Terms. Each delegate shall serve for a term of two years with half of the representatives elected each year.

Section 4. General Assembly: Functions. The General Assembly shall:

a. Serve as the representative body of the participating agencies with representatives actively engaged in the support and implementation of the policies, objectives and programs of the CITE Project;

b. Provide for the election of Executive Board at the May meeting and within the limitations stated in the Bylaws;

c. Consider and act upon proposed amendments to the Constitution and Bylaws;

d. Adopt the annual budget;

e. Take such action not in conflict with this Constitution or Bylaws necessary to achieve the goals and objectives of CITE;

f. Decide all issues requiring voting by majority vote of official delegates present at the General Assembly.

Article IV. Executive Board.

Section 1. There shall be an Executive Board composed of representatives from each agency participating in the Project as identified and enumerated in the Bylaws. The Director of the Project and one State Department of Education representative shall serve as ex-officio, non-voting members.

Section 2. Terms. Members of the Executive Board shall serve two-year terms. Half of the Board members shall be elected each year. For the first year following the adoption of this Constitution, half of the membership shall be elected for one year, the other half for two-year terms. Elections to the Board shall be conducted at the May meeting.

Section 3. Chairman of the Executive Board. The Executive Board shall elect a Chairman from the membership of the Board. The Chairman shall preside over the meetings of the Executive Board, assist in the preparation of the agenda of meetings, and otherwise assist the Director in the implementation of Board policies and activities.

Section 4. Functions. The Executive Board shall:

a. Consider and act on all matters of policy, objectives, plans, and standards for programs and resources in accordance with the goals and objectives of the CITE Project;

b. Serve as the Local Education Authority for fiscal matters, adopt an annual budget, be responsible for approval for payment of all expenditures, approve monthly fiscal reports, present a yearly report at the May General Assembly meeting, and provide an annual audit of the Project;

c. Select the Director of the Project and determine the terms of his contract with regard to salary and responsibilities;

d. Designate a treasurer and determine bonds of security;

e. Designate a secretary to serve the Executive Council to keep appropriate minutes of all meetings;

f. Consider and act on requests of agencies to become full- or part-time participating members of the Project;

g. Establish a regular calendar of meetings and call special meetings as requested by one of the participating agencies;

h. In cooperation with the Director, adopt the agenda and set the date for meetings of the General Assembly;

i. Assess and evaluate current operations in relation to policy, objectives, plans and standards;

j. Represent the interests of those participating agencies which elected members of the Executive Board and provide means and methods for keeping all participating agencies and members informed of the activities of the Project;

k. In cooperation with the Director, establish and dissolve committees and groups as is necessary to carry out the policies, objectives, plans, and standards of the Project;

Section 5. Voting Procedures. All questions on which a formal vote is requested, either by the Chair or by one member present, shall be decided by majority vote providing a quorum is present. A QUORUM shall consist of at least fifty percent of the official Executive Board.

Article V. The Director. Staff.

Section 1. A Director shall be recruited, selected, and appointed by the Executive Board in accordance with criteria established by the Board and the policies and objectives of the CITE Project.

Section 2. Term and Salary. The term and salary of the Director shall be determined by the Executive Board.

Section 3. The Director shall be responsible to the Executive Board.

Section 4. Functions. The Director shall:

a. Administer policies, objectives, and plans developed by the Executive Board;

b. Prepare and administer the budget, as authorized by the Executive Board, and establish a procedure for accounting for expenditures;

c. Serve as a non-voting consultant and adviser to the Executive Board

d. Initiate and present plans to the Executive Board designed to implement the policies and objectives of the Project;

e. In administering approved policies and programs, be responsible for decision making, organizing and delegating responsibility with respect to daily (or short term) operations of programs, personnel, physical facilities, and finance;

f. Oversee Project activities as developed and/or approved by the Executive Board, facilitating arrangements, assisting groups as needed, and serving as consultant;

g. Serve as the central agent for receiving reports, organizing them for dissemination as required;

h. Develop a regular means for keeping all participants and agencies informed of the activites, plans, decisions, and accomplishments of the Project;

i. Assist the Executive Board in the recruitment and selection of individuals and/or groups to serve the Project in consultative and advisory capacities for specified tasks;

j. In cooperation with the Executive Board, plan the agenda and set the date for the meetings of the General Assembly;

k. In cooperation with the Chairman of the Executive Board, plan the agenda and set dates for the meetings of the Board;

l. Prepare an annual written report of CITE activities to be submitted to the Executive Board one month prior to the May General Assembly meeting.

Section 5. Staff. Recruit and select staff for the office of the Director as authorized by the Executive Board.

Article VI. Amendent of the Constitution and Bylaws.

Section 1. Proposal of Amendments: Sponsors. Amendments to the Constitution or the Bylaws may be proposed by one or more of the following sponsors:

a. By a vote of the Executive Board equal to at least half of the membership of the Executive Board;

b. By at least two (2) agency delegations to the General Assembly, either by a majority vote of each delegation, or by a petition signed by a majority of the members of each delegation;

c. By petition of any ten (10) or more official delegates to the General Assembly.

Section 2. Amendment of the Constitution. This Constitution may be amended at a meeting of the General Assembly by a two-thirds (2/3) vote of the delegates present and voting if the proposed change shall have been presented to the Executive Board thirty (30) days in advance of consideration by the General Assembly, and if distributed by the Executive Board to the official delegates to the General Assembly fifteen (15) days in advance of consideration by the General Assembly.

Section 3. Amendment of the Bylaws. A proposal for amendment of the Bylaws shall be presented in writing to the Executive Board no later than thirty (30) days preceding a meeting of the General Assembly. The text of the proposed amendment shall be printed and distributed to official delegates to the General Assembly at least fifteen (15) days in advance of its consideration at such a meeting. The amendment shall be effective if approved by a majority of the delegates present and voting.

Section 4. Voting on Amendments. Effective Date. In voting on proposed amendments to the Constitution or the Bylaws, printed ballots or their equivalents shall be used. Unless the Amendment otherwise provides, it shall take effect thirty (30) days following its adoption.

Section 5. Withdrawal of Proposed Amendments. The sponsor of a proposed amendment to the Constitution or the Bylaws may request its withdrawal as follows:

a. If proposed by the Executive Board, the request shall be made by signed petition by at least half of the membership of that body.

b. If proposed by two (2) agency delegations, the request shall be signed by at least two thirds (2/3) of the delegates from each agency.

c. If proposed petition of any ten (10) or more official delegates to the General Assembly, the request shall be signed by at least two-thirds (2/3) of such delegates.

Requests for withdrawal shall be submitted in writing to the Chairman of the Executive Board three (3) days prior to the date set for consideration of the proposed amendment by the General Assembly. Withdrawal of a proposal shall be effective when consented to by the General Assembly by majority vote of delegates present and voting.

Article VII. Ratification and Effective Date.

This Constitution shall be adopted when ratified by a two-thirds (2/3) vote of members of a General Assembly meeting present and voting. It shall become effective sixty (60) days following ratification by the General Assembly.

PROPOSED BYLAWS

1. Goals and Objectives. The goals and objectives of CITE are stated in Article I, Section 1, of the Constitution. Changes in or additions to the objectives shall be consistent with the goals of the Project and upon two-thirds (2/3) vote by the Executive Board.

2. Membership. 2-1. Categories of Membership. Membership in the CITE Project may be drawn from the following categories and sub-catories. Membership becomes effective when application for membership is complete and approved by the Executive Board:

Members of the school community of the schools participating

Members of Boards of Education of school districts with school communities participating in CITE

Members of the BOCES staff serving the area in which participating school communities are located

Members of a school district or school officially designated by Boards of Education in accordance with a Resolution of Commitment. Members are to be selected from each of the following subcategories (also known as "agencies"):

Superintendent of Schools, or similar district-wide positions

Building principals of the schools designated to participate

Classroom teaching staff of each school participating

Members of professional teacher organizations representing those organizations and not as representatives of the school or school district

Teacher Education Students from the institutions of higher education participating in CITE with two sub-categories:

Undergraduate teacher education students

Graduate teacher education students

Institutions of Higher Education engaged in and/or committed to teacher education with the following sub-categories:

Supervisors of student teaching

Instructors of college courses

Administrators at the institutions of higher education

2-2. Agencies. An agency engaged as a participant in the CITE Project shall be defined as:

A group of people, an organization, or an institution that meets the requirements of one of the categories or sub-categories of membership in the CITE Project.

The members of each agency shall be that agency's constituency from which representatives to the General Assembly shall be selected. Each agency shall determine its membership consistent with the categories or sub-categories of membership.

2-3. All agencies and members shall be eligible to receive services from CITE consistent with the goals and objectives of the Project and to receive reports and publications of the Project.

2-4. The right to vote and to hold elective office or appointive position shall be limited to active members of the agencies that are full-time participants in the CITE Project, unless otherwise provided by action of the Executive Board.

3. General Assembly. The General Assembly shall be composed of one official delegate from each participating agency with the following exceptions:

Teacher Education Students may have two official delegates from each teacher education institution sending delegates to the General Assembly and six official doctoral student delegates from graduate teacher education institutions sending delegates to the General Assembly

BOCES Districts shall be entitled to two official delegates to the General Assembly

Each institution of Higher Education, in addition to teacher education students, shall be entitled to one official delegate to the General Assembly from each of the following sub-categories:

Supervisors of student teaching

Instructors of college courses

Administrators at the institution

The New York State Education Department shall be entitled to two delegates to the General Assembly

4. Executive Board. The Executive Board shall be composed of one representative from each agency with official delegates at the Annual General Meeting, with the following exceptions:

One representative from the Business/Industry category, selected from the Business/Industry delegates to the annual General Assembly

Three Teacher Education Students, selected by the official undergraduate teacher education student delegates at the annual General Assembly

Two Doctoral Teacher Education Students, selected by the official graduate teacher education student delegates to the annual General Assembly

One representative from each Insitution of Higher Education, selected by the official delegates of each Institution to the annual General Assembly

One non voting representative from New York State Education Department

The Director of the Project, non-voting status

A BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR SHARED DECISION MAKING

Albrook, Robert C. "Participative Management: Time for a Second Look." in Administering Human Resources, edited by Francis M. Trusty, McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1971.

Allen, Wendell C. "Comments on Collaboration in Teacher Education." PBTE Newsletter, vol. 2, February 1974, p. 3.

Alutto, Joseph A. and James A. Belasco. Decisional Participation Among Teaching Personnel and Perceptions of Administrative Influence. March 1970. 17 pages. Paper presented for the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Minneapolis, March 1970.

Belasco, James A. and Joseph A. Alutto. "Decisional Participation and Teacher Satisfaction." Educational Administration Quarterly, 8; 1; pp.44-58, W 1972.

Bennis, Warren. "Beyond Bureaucracy." Transactions, July-August, 1965.

_____ "Theory and Method in Applying Behavioral Science to Planned Organizational Change." Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, I (1964), pp. 337-360.

Boyan, Norman J. "The Emergent Role of the Teacher in the Authority Structure of the School." in Organizations and Human Behavior, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1969.

Bridges, Edwin M., "A Model for Shared Decision Making in the School Principalship." Central Midwestern Regional Educational Lab., St. Ann, Mo. 16 pages. Or see: Educational Administration Quarterly, III, No. 1 (Winter 1967), 51.

Browder, Lesley H., Jr., Ed. Emerging Patterns of Administrative Accountability, McCutchan Publishing Company, Berkeley, 1971. (See #27, 44, 46, 125, 190)

Burr, Donald F. Simu-School: A Tool and Process for Educational Planning. Final Report. American Institute of Architects, Washington, D.C.; Technomics, Inc., Chicago, Ill.

Collier, Richard E. "Vehicles for Formulating Policies and Developing Recommendations in a CBTE Program", PBTE Newsletter, vol. 2, February 1974, pp. 4-5.

Edwards, Ward. A Bibliography of Research on Behavioral Decision Processes to 1968. Ann Arbor: Department of Psychology, University of Michigan, January 1969.

Etzioni, Amitai. Complex Organizations, a Sociological Reader. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1966.

Frey, Sherman H. "Policy Formulation--A Plan Involving Teachers," The Clearing House, vol. 43, January, 1969.

Graham, Robert G. and Clifford F. Gray. Business Games Handbook, American Management Association, Inc., 135 West 50 Street, New York, New York.

Hall, Jay and Martha S. Williams. "Group Dynamics Training and Improved Decision Making," Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, VI (January-February-March, 1970), pp. 39-67.

Hall, John S. Models for Rational Decision Making: Analysis of Literature and Selected Bibliography. Eugene, Oregon: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Administration, University of Oregon, September, 1970.

Halpin, Andrew W. "Leadership in the School," in Organizational Behavior in Schools, by Robert G. Owens, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.

Hoffman, L. Richard. "Group Problem Solving." Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, Leonard Berkowitz (ed.). New York: Academic Press, 1965, pp. 99-127.

Jensen, Gale Edward. Problems and Principles of Human Organization in Educational Systems. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ann Arbor Publishing, May, 1969.

Kirst, Michael W. Issues in Governance for Performance-Based Teacher Education, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C., 1973.

Kirst, Michael W. and David L. Grossman. Politics of Elementary and Secondary Education. Research Workshop Report. Working Document. National Academy of Education Stanford, Calif.; National Academy of Sciences - National Research Council, Washington, D.C., January 1971, 61 pages.

_____ and Decker F. Walker. "An Analysis of Curriculum Policy-Making." Review of Educational Research; 41; 5; pp.479-509, December 1971.

Lansky, Leonard et al. The Effects of Human Relations Training on Diagnosing Skills and Planning for Change. Eugene, Oregon: Center for Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, July 1969.

Miles, M. B. and Richard A. Schmuck. "Improving Schools through Organization Development: An Overview." In R. A. Schmuck and M. B. Miles (eds.) Organization Development in Schools. Palo Alto: National Press Books, 1971, pp. 1-27.

Osborn, William C. and Barbara Ettinger Goodman. A Tentative Organizational Schema for Decision-Making Problems. Alexandria, Va.: Human Resources Research Organization, July 1966.

_____, et al. Social and Technological Change, Implications for Education. The Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, Eugene, Oregon, 1970.

_____ and Philip J. Runkel. A Preliminary Manual for Organizational Training in Schools. Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon, 72 pages, 1968.

_____, Philip J. Runkel, Steven L. Saturen, Ronald T. Martell and C. Brooklyn Derr. Handbook of Organization Development in Schools. Palo Alto: National Press Books, 1972.

Strau, David A., Christopher Thorsen and Ruth E. Thorsen. Tools for Change: A Basic Course in Problem-Solving. Interaction, Inc., September 1969.

Taylor, P.W., P.C. Berry and C.H. Block. "Does Group Participation When Using Brainstorming Facilitate or Inhibit Creative Thinking?" Admin. Science Quarterly, vol. 3, 1958, pp. 23-47.

Trusty, Francis M. (compiled and edited). Administering Human Resources. McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1971.

Van De Ven, Andrew and Andre L. Delbecq. "Nominal Versus Interacting Group Processes for Committee Decision-Making Effectiveness," Academy of Management Journal, XIV, June 1971, pp. 203-212.